



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,724	10/07/2003	Gary Johnston	WEAT/0487	8287
36735	7590	12/06/2005	EXAMINER	
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P. 3040 POST OAK BOULEVARD, SUITE 1500 HOUSTON, TX 77056			STEPHENSON, DANIEL P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3672	

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/680,724	JOHNSTON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel P. Stephenson	3672	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).


10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☒ Other: PTO 892 Notice of References Cited.


DAVID BAGNELL
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: It is the assertion of the applicant that there is no motivation to combine the Jackson or Whang references with the Simpson and /or Clark references as they are non analogous art and one of ordinary skill in the art of expander tools would not turn to the bearing art. The examiner respectfully traverses this assertion. Both the Jackson and Whang references present different aspects of bearings or bearings themselves that any person of ordinary skill in an art utilizing bearings would know to exist. They solve specific problems with certain bearings and improve upon existing bearings. The examiner is relying on the bearing teaching alone and is not concerned with the machinery that the bearings are a part of. And they qualify as analagous art in that the applicant is trying to solve an overheating/wear problem, and this is the basis of the bearing art.

It is the assertion of the applicant that Nrwin v. Erlichman does not speak to the improvement that results from splitting the roller and thrust bearing into separate parts allowing them to be made of different materials. However, Examiner notes that the improvement of using different materials is not expressed in the claims.

It is the asseertion of the applicant that the examiner cannot rely on Official Notice without some evidence in the art. As such, that examiner is providing a reference, Solorenko et al. (as seen on the enclosed PTO 892), which speaks to the usefulness of a thrust bearing (114) between two rotating objects. It relieves torsional stress as put forth by the examiner in the Official Notice of last action.

For these reasons the rejections of the previous final action are deemed to be with merit and are retained.